

1 THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 DAVID SCHWINDT,

11 Plaintiff,

v.

12 MENZIES AVIATION, INC.,

13 Defendant.

14 CASE NO. C16-1586-JCC

ORDER

15 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff David Schwindt's motion to compel  
16 (Dkt. No. 10) and Defendant Menzies Aviation's motion for a protective order (Dkt. No. 12).  
17 Having thoroughly considered the parties' briefing and the relevant record, the Court finds oral  
18 argument unnecessary and hereby GRANTS the motion to compel and GRANTS the motion for  
19 protective order for the reasons explained herein.

20 As an initial matter, the Court notes that discovery motions are strongly disfavored. Here,  
21 the two motions are related and it is apparent that this dispute could have been resolved without  
22 the Court's interference. Plaintiff moves to compel production of Defendant's safety manual.  
23 (Dkt. No. 10 at 1.) Defendant has agreed to produce the safety manual, provided Plaintiff  
24 stipulate to a protective order, which Plaintiff has refused to do. (Dkt. No. 12 at 2.) Defendant  
25 therefore moves for entry of a protective order substantially similar to the Western District of  
26 Washington's Model Stipulated Protective Order. (*Id.* at 1.)

The Court is inclined to agree with both parties. The Court therefore GRANTS Defendant's motion for a protective order<sup>1</sup> (Dkt. No. 12) and GRANTS Plaintiff's motion to compel the safety manual (Dkt. No. 10). The Court notes, however, that it does not enter Defendant's proposed protective order exactly as presented. Rather than state that safety manuals are confidential, the order states that they, and other similar materials, may be confidential. With that clarification, the Court reminds Plaintiff that even with a protective order in place, the non-designating party can always challenge a confidentiality designation.

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's motion to compel discovery (Dkt. No. 10) and Defendant's motion for a protective order (Dkt. No. 12) are GRANTED. Defendant shall produce the safety manual within 14 days of the entry of the protective order.

DATED this 13th day of July, 2017.

John C. Conner

John C. Coughenour  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

<sup>1</sup> The Protective Order itself shall be docketed as a separate entry.